

3036, a bill that would bring transparency to taxpayer-funded overseas trips taken by members of Congress. On behalf of the more than 1.2 million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), I urge you to support this legislation.

The military maintains a specially outfitted VIP fleet out of Andrews Air Force Base that can cost up to \$10,000 per hour to operate. Members of Congress often take advantage of these military aircraft for overseas travel, even in instances where commercial flights are readily available and more cost-effective. The cost of commercial airline travel is publicly disclosed, but the cost of travel on military-owned jets is not provided.

H.R. 3036 would require the Secretary of Defense to determine and disclose the cost of foreign trips for members of Congress using military aircraft. These costs would then be publicly reported online through the House Clerk's website.

Military aircraft is necessary when flying into war zones or U.S. military installations overseas; however, the military fleet is too often used to shuttle members to back and forth to locations served by commercial airliners.

Members of Congress should be held accountable for every bill footed by taxpayers. All votes on H.R. 3036 will be among those considered in CCAGW's 2009 Congressional Ratings.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. SCHATZ,
President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MASSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MASSA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE TRAGEDY OF A SOCIALIST AMERICA AND ITS DESTRUCTION OF HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this is not a roadmap. This is the Democrats' new health care plan, all of these white things. Can you believe that? I was just talking to my colleague over there, Mr. POE from Texas.

All of these white things are new agencies of government, new agencies of government that we're going to have to pay for in order to take care of the health of the Nation. Now, this thing is going to cost between \$1 and \$3 trillion over the next 10 years, and I doubt seriously if anybody who is writing this 1,200-page bill, or whatever it is, knows what this stuff does. It's just crazy. Look at all of these agencies. Look at the minefields that people have to go through to get to their doctors down there at the end to take care of their health care needs.

Other countries that have used this kind of an approach ration health care for senior citizens. They ration health care for people who have certain kinds of diseases. They have to wait months and months and months for MRIs and

for other things that we would get very rapidly here in the United States because we have the highest quality of health care in the world, and so we are going to create a government bureaucracy.

I hope my colleagues back in their offices are looking at this, because most of them haven't seen this.

We are creating a government bureaucracy that looks worse than any Federal highway system like in California. I mean you can't even find your way around this thing, but that's not the worst of it.

Since last October, this is how much money we've spent: \$700 billion on the TARP program, which includes \$54 billion for the auto bailout, which we really didn't need to do because they filed for bankruptcy anyhow, so that \$54 billion was wasted. Who cares. That's just taxpayers' money. Then we had \$1.1 trillion, including interest, for the stimulus package, which is not working, because they said that was going to keep unemployment below 8 percent. Now it is 9.5 and is going up like a rocket, so that didn't work. That's \$1.1 trillion. On the omnibus spending bill, we had \$410 billion. The defense supplemental was \$106 billion. Now, there may have been some necessity for that. The SCHIP bill was \$73 billion. The cap-and-trade is going to cost every family in this country between \$1,000 and \$3,000 a year in additional expenses for turning on their lights or for putting gasoline in their cars or for getting gas to heat their homes. Then there's this health care bill, which will be \$1 trillion to \$3 trillion, and I'll tell you: It is going to be a lot more than that.

Let me tell you a little story, my colleagues who may be paying attention. When I was a state senator, the Federal Government came into Indiana and said, If you don't take the Medicaid bill, we're going to withdraw \$2.5 million in Federal highway funds. They were blackmailing the State of Indiana into taking the Medicaid program by saying that we were going to lose \$2.5 million if we didn't take it.

I went up to the Senate floor, and I said, Hey, it's going to cost us 10 times this amount of money if we do take Medicaid. I said it would cost about \$25 million. Do you know how much that costs now? Between \$1 billion and \$2 billion a year. I was so far off it isn't funny.

This thing right here is not going to cost \$1 trillion to \$3 trillion. It's going to cost trillions more than that. It's going to reduce the quality of health care. It's going to cause the rationing of health care, and it's going to ruin the system of health care we have in this country. It's just a tragedy that this is happening.

This administration is moving as rapidly as they can toward a socialistic form of government, and everybody in this country ought to know it. They are trying to control and are controlling the investment business, the bank-

ing business, the automobile business; with cap-and-trade, they're controlling the energy business; and now the health care business. This is really a tragic time for America, and I hope everybody in this country who may be paying attention will really take a close look at this and will call their Congressman if they are paying attention.

I know I can't address them, Mr. Speaker, but if I were addressing the American people, I would say, Contact your Congressman and tell him you don't want this mess passed into law. It is going to jeopardize the quality of your health care here in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1815

CALLING FOR BOYCOTT OF STELLA D'ORO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues. I want to call everyone's attention to something that is happening in my district. It is actually very disgraceful. There is a plant called Stella D'oro. Everyone knows about Stella D'oro, the cookies and the cakes that they make. In fact, for many years I spoke about Stella D'oro with a sense of pride. When I appeared on the Colbert show, I took out a package of cookies, of bread sticks of Stella D'oro's and talked with pride about some of the things that were being made in my district.

The Stella D'oro company was founded in 1932 and was family run until they sold to RJR Nabisco in 1992. RJR Nabisco became a part of Kraft Foods. It was taken over by Kraft. And what happened was, Kraft Foods then sold Stella D'oro to a company called Brynwood Partners. Brynwood Partners really doesn't care about running this place or being fair to its workers. It really only cares about the bottom line. So what they did was they pushed the workers, and they told them that in order to keep their jobs, in order to finance their purchase of Stella D'oro, the workers would have to take a 25 percent pay cut for its 135 workers, many of whom had worked there for decades, were proud of the product

they created. And besides that, they didn't stop there. They told the workers that they would have to make health insurance unaffordable by imposing crushing premiums on these people, eliminating their holidays, eliminating their vacation and sick pay and other crippling costs. So the workers, who are not making a lot of money to begin with, there is no way that they could suddenly accept this. So they went on strike. And Stella D'oro—again, Brynwood Partners—responded by hiring a bunch of scabs to replace the strikers and, in essence, dismiss the strikers. Well, the strikers appealed to the National Labor Relations Board, the NLRB; and the NLRB ruled in favor of the strikers. It told Brynwood, who now runs Stella D'oro, that they must take the striking workers back with some back pay.

And now what is Brynwood Partners threatening to do? They are saying that they're going to close down, shut down the company entirely; and in essence, these workers would totally lose their jobs. How vindictive that is. They win a ruling from the National Labor Relations Board only to have Brynwood Partners say they're going to shut down this company, which has been run since 1932. It's really disgraceful when a company like Brynwood Partners—which obviously doesn't care about making cookies, doesn't care about the neighborhood community-type of business that it was—only uses this company as the bottom line.

Just the other day we had a rally in front of the Stella D'oro company in the Bronx, in my district, to show the workers that we stand by them and support them. I want to let Brynwood Partners know that I am not going to be quiet about this or take this lying down. There are other things that Brynwood Partners own, and we really ought to scrutinize and watch everything they do because if they are allowed to get away with this, they can get away with anything, if nothing more than the bottom line, as far as I am concerned, corporate greed. Something ought to be done for these workers. Again, the National Labor Relations Board ruled in favor of the workers, and so the reaction of the company is to just close it down. That is a disgrace. It should not be happening in 2009. This Congress needs to take note of it and needs to stand behind these workers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GLOBAL TRADE AND JOB CREATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this evening I have taken out this Special Order to talk about an issue that is of grave importance to the American people. There is no doubt about the fact that the American people are hurting. We are seeing tremendous losses across this country. People are losing their homes. In California, the State that I am privileged to represent, we have an unemployment rate statewide of 11.5 percent. People are losing their jobs; people are losing their businesses; and people are hurting. It's something that has been recognized by Democrats and Republicans alike. We right now are witnessing the implementation of policies that I believe, very sincerely, will exacerbate the problem.

We were promised when we were provided with the so-called economic stimulus bill—\$787 billion, but if you include interest a \$1 trillion stimulus bill—we were promised by the President of the United States that if we implemented that measure, we would not see the unemployment rate exceed 8 percent. And we all know today, unfortunately, as I said, in California the unemployment rate statewide is 11.5 percent. Nationwide it is 9.5 percent. Economists across the board and the President of the United States, even in an interview yesterday, have indicated that we are going to see a continued increase in the unemployment rate. Now that was, again, after we were promised that implementation of the so-called economic stimulus bill which would prevent unemployment from exceeding the 8 percent level.

Since that period of time, we have seen this House pass a massive tax, which is going to be inflicted on families across this country as it relates to energy. Now you will recall one of the hallmarks of the President's platform and the statements made repeatedly by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been that we would not see any kind of tax increase imposed on Americans earning under \$250,000 a year; and yet we know, based on the very modest report that came from the Congressional Budget Office, that we will see at least a \$175 increase in the energy tax imposed on Americans as it relates to this so-called cap-and-trade measure.

The debate that's going on right now relates to health care. We all want to do everything that we can to ensure that those 40-plus million Americans who are uninsured have access to quality, affordable health care. But the measure that is before us, I clearly believe, undermines the quality of care and the assurance that people will have access to quality health care. We also know that the cost imposed on small businesses and big businesses across this country will be very great. And those numbers, as have been shown in a wide range of reports that have been

brought before us, have led many to indicate that there will be a tremendous job loss because of this. Because the increased costs, as it relates to health care, inflicted on small businesses will lead many of them to reduce the number of jobs.

So I am very concerned, obviously, as are the people who I am privileged to represent from the Los Angeles area and the people across this country and, frankly, I think many Democrats as well as Republicans here in the House of Representatives, they are very, very concerned about this issue of dramatically increasing the size, the scope and the reach of the Federal Government. It is very well intentioned, of course, Mr. Speaker. It is very well intentioned because we all want to make sure that we focus on improving our environment and decrease our dependence on fossil fuels. We all want to ensure that every American does have access to quality affordable health care, and we want to make sure that we get the economy back on track. But I believe that the trillion-dollar economic stimulus bill, the so-called economic stimulus bill, the so-called cap-and-trade bill that has been put forward and the measure that would dramatically increase the cost of health care and diminish the quality of care are troubling signs. The reason I have taken out this Special Order—and I know I am going to be joined by colleagues of mine, Mr. Speaker—is that we are in a position where we still have a chance to actually focus on job creation.

I'm going to talk this evening about something that has been very near and dear to me for many, many years. It goes back to my education in college; and that is, the notion of the United States of America playing a leading role in global economic growth so that we can increase the number of good American jobs. That means good jobs right here in the United States of America. I believe that trade is key to that. Trade, global trade is going to play a big role in creating jobs, jobs, jobs. Because the natural question that has continued to come forward from this promise that we would not see the unemployment rate exceed 8 percent is, Where are the jobs? We have a chance. Mr. Speaker, we still have an opportunity to turn the corner on that. With a shrinking economy and mounting job losses and anxiety for what the future holds, we need the job-creating power of open trade more now than we have ever needed it. It's one of the very sad ironies of the trade debate. Tough economic times often lead people to say that we should pull up the drawbridge and lead to a term that I know no one likes to have hanging around their necks, but that term is protectionism. Protectionism is a bad thing. But frankly, during tough economic times, there are many people who happen to respond by being proponents of protectionist measures, in fact, avoiding the notion of more open trade. There is a fundamental and very dangerous misconception held by many, including,